

DISPATCH		CLASSIFICATION S E C R E T	DISPATCH SYMBOL AND NO. EGFA-32417
TO Chief, SR Chief, EE COS, Germany		HEADQUARTERS FILE NO. 74-124-29/3	
FROM Chief of Base, Frankfurt		DATE 14 November 1960	
SUBJECT REDWOOD AERODYNAMIC/Operational Roman SHPORLIUK Interim Report of Operational Activity		REF: "AS-3" (CHECK "X" ONE)	
ACTION REQUIRED FYI		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MARKED FOR INDEXING <input type="checkbox"/> NO INDEXING REQUIRED <input type="checkbox"/> INDEXING CAN BE JUDGED BY QUALIFIED EQ. DESK ONLY	

- A. EGFW 11362, 3 Oct 60
- B. FROB 8023
- C. DIR 07999
- D. FROB 8080
- E. FROB 8082
- F. DIR 09768
- G. FROB 8165

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 3B2B
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
DATE 2007

1. This dispatch is an interim report of the operational activity undertaken at FOB in connection with Roman SHPORLIUK, a Polish Ukrainian student at Nuffield College, Oxford University. We have set forth not only the facts as they have appeared to us but also some of our operational thinking lying behind the suggestions we have made. We have attempted, therefore, to give Headquarters as full a picture as we can on this type of operation. We briefed AECASSOWARY 29 on 20 October 1960 on Subject in response to Reference A and passed to him a sterilized copy of the attachment to Reference A to refresh his memory. AECASSOWARY 29 stated that he had heard of the case from AECASSOWARY 2, but that he had not met the Subject personally. AECASSOWARY 29 had last heard that Subject desired to return to Poland, but AECASSOWARY 29 could not remember just when this information was obtained. AECASSOWARY 29 was quite interested in the fact that Subject had changed his mind and considered that this case might contain a good opportunity for a long range operation. He agreed to carry out whatever instructions we received from Headquarters.

2. We first discussed the approach to Dr. OLEKSA HORBACH, who was really the key in the operation at this stage since he is in correspondence with Subject. AECASSOWARY 29 had never met Dr. HORBACH but knew that he was a personal friend of AECASSOWARY 2 and was well thought of by AECASSOWARY 2. AECASSOWARY 29 believed that if AECASSOWARY 2 would write a personal letter of introduction to Dr. HORBACH, AECASSOWARY 29 would be able to meet him as a representative of AEBEEHIVE and carry on from there. We discussed and agreed that AECASSOWARY 29's cover could be maintained in this approach since it was already determined that AEBEEHIVE had an interest in Subject from the point of view that a Ukrainian of his stature would be an asset to AEBEEHIVE. We agreed that there need be no discussion between AECASSOWARY 29 and Dr. HORBACH relating to AECASSOWARY 29's operational activity in Europe since this operation had not yet reached the stage where operational overtones had to be introduced. We decided that AECASSOWARY 29 would induce Dr. HORBACH to discuss the case of Subject and to produce the correspondence so that AECASSOWARY 29 could assess the situation from an operational point of view, if required, without Dr. HORBACH being aware of it. AECASSOWARY 29 felt that there would be no difficulty in obtaining Dr. HORBACH's cooperation in the matter once his bona fides had been established from AECASSOWARY 2. We both felt that we would have to continue Dr. HORBACH in the case until a personal meeting on the basis of AEBEEHIVE intents could be arranged between Subject and AECASSOWARY 29. We considered it quite possible that Dr. HORBACH could be kept ignorant of the operational aspects that might develop after that meeting. We knew that we would have to ask Dr. HORBACH to continue the correspondence until such a meeting could be arranged, but AECASSOWARY 29 felt there would be no difficulty in inducing Dr. HORBACH to follow our suggestions in this correspondence.

FORM 53b

USE PREVIOUS EDITION,
REPLACES FORMS
51-20, 51-20A AND 51-20
WHICH ARE OBSOLETE.

CLASSIFICATION
S E C R E T

☒ CONTINUED

1

74-124-29/3

cc PDV

Our next consideration was the actual operation itself, both the immediate and the future considerations. We were at some disadvantage in that we did not know exactly what the status of Subject's decision was, who knew of his decision, who was helping him in his plans to remain in England, and whether the British authorities, including SMITH, or the Polish authorities were aware of his plans. Therefore we could only plan in theory and then play it by ear as each of the above facts came to light through correspondence or a meeting. We had two general lines of approach to the problem:

a. Both AECASSOWARY 29 and the undersigned felt that it would be much more to our advantage if the circumstances would permit us to meet Subject before any overt moves were made to obtain permission to remain in England which might preclude immediate operational plans. In this situation we could very quickly determine whether Subject's decision was so final that we could not persuade him to accept a recruitment and return to Poland. If the decision were not so final, AECASSOWARY 29 would then assess Subject and see whether he would be a suitable candidate for such a mission and whether he would accept a recruitment pitch. We realized that if all went well up to this point we would be faced with many operational decisions, but we decided to defer these until we had firmer indications that such decisions would have to be made. Nevertheless, we felt that such an approach to Subject would be most worthwhile if the circumstances were fortuitous and proper in order to establish a recruited and briefed agent in Poland who might have direct contact with the Ukraine.

b. Our second line of approach was to encourage Subject to remain in England and then to debrief him thoroughly on his contacts in Poland and the USSR in order to exploit these contacts through other means at a later date. This would also require a personal meeting with Subject in order to gain complete cooperation from him. We felt that it would be better, if possible, to pursue this objective prior to the time when the defection came to public attention in order to protect the future contacts. The problem of working through Dr. HORBACH was considerably lessened inasmuch as he need not know anything about our debriefing Subject from an operational point of view. We felt that this approach was sufficiently interesting to follow up although it was not as interesting as the first alternative. We believed that contact between Subject and AECASSOWARY 29 was desirable in any case in order to assure that Subject, after defection, was steered into proper channels to ABERDEEN. We felt that AECASSOWARY 29 would be better for this purpose than Dr. HORBACH because of AECASSOWARY 29's cover. We therefore decided to approach Headquarters as in Ref B.

4. Upon receipt of Ref C, AECASSOWARY 29 was instructed to contact Dr. HORBACH under his cover in order to make his acquaintance and begin to develop HORBACH on the affair of Subject. We decided that we could do this securely on the basis of AECASSOWARY 2's letter even though we had not received a POA from Dr. HORBACH. We felt that the operational activity of AECASSOWARY 29 in Europe need not be discussed with HORBACH at this stage. AECASSOWARY 2's letter provided complete bona fides for AECASSOWARY 29 and AECASSOWARY 29 was not mentioned by Dr. HORBACH. Dr. HORBACH had no reservations in accepting AECASSOWARY 29 as a representative of ABERDEEN and immediately brought up the subject of Subject. Dr. HORBACH showed all the correspondence to AECASSOWARY 29 and AECASSOWARY 29 was thus able to report the following information, which we cabled in Refs D and E:

a. HORBACH has met Subject in Warsaw in 1957, Subject having been introduced by ~~Mykhailo~~ ~~MAIV~~. Subject was studying for a Bachelor of Letters degree at the Lublin State University, and was the student and assistant lecturer for an unknown professor of History of Constitutional Law. This unknown professor was a friend of Prof. ~~Isaac~~ ~~BERLIN~~ of Nuffield College, Oxford University. This unknown professor and ~~BERLIN~~ together assisted Subject to obtain first a Ford Foundation scholarship and then

a Haffield College scholarship in order to study at Haffield College. Subject came to the college in December 1948 or January 1949 on a scholarship of £1000 a month which ended on 30 September 1950. Subject has been receiving special funds from Haffield College since that time. Haffield visited Subject at Oxford in April 1950, but Subject had made no mention of his plans to remain in the West at that time.

In March 1950, Subject wrote to Haffield stating that he liked Oxford very much and would not mind staying there for a while longer. In July 1950, Subject wrote Haffield asking the latter's opinion about Subject's remaining permanently in England. Haffield replied that he thought that Subject and Bethany return to Poland for several reasons. Haffield explained that as soon as Subject and his intentions known to his supervisors at Oxford that he intended to remain in England rather than return to Poland, the supervisors would have interest in him. Haffield suggested that the supervisors were interested in making friends with a Pole who would then return to Poland with a favorable opinion of England and would be less interested in another emigre from behind the Iron Curtain. Haffield then explained that Subject should realize that he could make a successful career as a professor in Poland and could do something of value by this profession there, but that he probably could not make such an important career in the West. On 15 August 1950, Subject wrote to Haffield that he would probably remain in the West and gave five reasons for this decision:

1) Poland was not and could not be Subject's homeland since Subject was really a Ukrainian and not a Pole.

2) Subject has had to conceal his Ukrainian nationality while in Poland and if he were now to reveal this true nationality this would be considered a criminal act in Poland.

3) Subject is interested in Sovietology as a career and obviously cannot make a career out of this in Poland.

4) Subject has developed a complex as a result of concealing his nationality in Poland and desires to become a normal man again. He is interested in becoming a journalist in the West if he cannot be a real scholar.

5) Haffield College has promised to help Subject with a job and Prof. Paul Haffield has promised to ask the British Home Office to grant a permit to enable Subject to remain in England.

On 7 September 1950, Subject wrote Haffield that he had finally decided to stay in England. He indicated that he had disclosed his Ukrainian nationality to his supervisors at the College. Haffield told AECASSOWAY that the authorities probably know of Subject's decision to remain in England because Subject had indicated that the college authorities were very shocked at the fact that Subject was a Ukrainian and not a Pole when they were at the decision to remain in England.

c. Subject wrote to HORBACH concerning two fellow students from Lublin State University who are now in the USSR. One is a Ukrainian student, name unknown to us, who is in Moscow on a scholarship. This student is in correspondence with Subject and mailed to him a catalog of Ukrainian newspapers which are published and can be obtained in the USSR. Subject said that this catalog showed that the Ukrainian newspapers are getting more and more under the influence of the Russians, and this was the basis of a paper that he has written for AEBEENHIVE. Subject's other friend is Mykhailo LESIV, Curie Skladowska, Ulitsa 3 May 2235, Lublin, Poland. LESIV is about 26-27, is married and is a Ukrainian. He is now in Kiev on a scholarship from the Lublin State University. LESIV's parents are living in Herrykovo, Poleskie Polesie, region of Poland. Subject mentioned that there was another family that he knows in Kiev and that he has several friends in Poland.

5. a. Dr. HORBACH is of the opinion that Subject is very high level in an excellent scholar and one of the most intelligent can be met in Poland in 1957. HORBACH reported that Subject was once side been he had been very critical in the discussion HORBACH had with him in Warsaw in 1957 concerning AECASSOWARY 1 politics and of the UPA actions during WWII. HORBACH reported that Subject had gone to a book store in England upon his arrival there and had purchased the newspaper "Ukrainian Thought". Subject had been very critical of the inflammatory posture of this paper during his discussion with HORBACH in England in 1959. Subject had also purchased the newspaper "Ukraine of Today" and was much more favorably impressed although there were still aspects with which he disagreed. AECASSOWARY 29 reported that the critique mentioned above concerning the profile of Ukrainian newspapers in the Soviet Union had been used in the "Ukraine of Today". HORBACH has asked Subject to write other articles for the paper and Subject has agreed. Both HORBACH and AECASSOWARY 29 are of the opinion that if Subject should remain in the West, he should be connected with AEBEENHIVE and would be an excellent addition to the group. AECASSOWARY 29 stated that from AECASSOWARY 1's point of view it would be almost as important for Subject to remain in the West for this purpose as it would be to dispatch Subject back to Poland on a mission.

b. In our discussion with AECASSOWARY 29 concerning the operational possibilities relating to Subject upon the receipt of the above information, we agreed that, although we did not have sufficient facts as yet to draw a conclusion, it appeared that the possibility of recruiting and dispatching Subject back to Poland was rather remote. We felt that too many people probably already knew that he was planning to remain in England and we did not know definitely that neither the Polish authorities nor the Polish authorities knew of his plans. We decided that there would be no real possibility to introduce AECASSOWARY 29 to Subject at this stage, but that we would be prepared for any eventually. We felt that we had to have considerably more information about the plans of Subject and his real state of mind before we could take further action. AECASSOWARY 29 will keep in touch with HORBACH in order to receive the latest news from Subject.

c. AECASSOWARY 29 asked HORBACH to write once more to Subject and to try to determine what the status is now of Subject's plans to travel and to determine who is knowledgeable of these plans. HORBACH will give Subject the name and address of "KOST", who is Konstantine Kostin, 8A Westbury Road, London W/5, suggesting that Subject get in touch with

him. HORBACH will write that he can write a letter to several persons. ALCASSOWARY 29 stated that he is a worker of HORBACH and will provide a link between Subject and HORBACH but will not be acting in an operational capacity. ALCASSOWARY 29 will again contact HORBACH after a suitable interval in order to learn from the correspondence from Subject where the operation stands.

6. Ref F arrived just prior to the receipt of HORBACH by ALCASSOWARY 29. ALCASSOWARY 29 was ordered to request HORBACH to continue the correspondence and to insert the necessary questions in the last letter from Subject which did not contain the requested information. ALCASSOWARY 29 contacted HORBACH again on 6 November and found that Subject had written on 29 October, each of which were called in Ref 3. Subject stated in his letter that he had decided to remain in England, but as a Polish citizen so that he could retain his Polish passport. Subject stated that he had sufficient savings and had received a new grant for 6 months from Nuffield College to continue his studies. Subject added that he couldn't get a job at Oxford, but probably could at some small college in the provinces in England. Subject listed the following as being knowledgeable of and sympathetic to his plans to remain in England:

Sir Isaac BERLIN	Professor at Nuffield College
D. W. CHESTER	The Warden of Nuffield College
John PLAMENATZ	Professor under whom Subject is writing his thesis
C. W. WOODHOUSE	Member of Parliament
Philip WILLIAMS	Occupation unknown
Prof. Fnu SEIDLER	Professor and supervisor of Subject at Lublin State University, Lublin, Poland.

Subject stated that BERLIN and CHESTER are now attempting to get a permit from the British Home Office so that Subject can remain in England as a Polish citizen. Subject desires to hold onto his Polish passport as long as possible. Subject's British visa expires on 30 November 1960. Subject also wrote the following information in his letter to HORBACH.

a. Subject's supervisor in Poland was Professor Fnu SEIDLER, who is the same nationality as Professor Isaac BERLIN. (ALCASSOWARY 29 stated that this meant that SEIDLER is Jewish since BERLIN is Jewish.) Subject stated that he owed his scholarship at Oxford to Professor SEIDLER. SEIDLER stated that Subject was Ukrainian and not Polish since SEIDLER was born in Stanislaw in the Ukraine from which Subject comes. SEIDLER's father was a solicitor and a member of Polish Parliament in 1929-1930. SEIDLER's father represented the ESMR party, which supported the Polish government at that time. Subject said that SEIDLER was rather sympathetic to the Ukrainian problem and on his own initiative established contacts between Lublin and Lvov. SEIDLER travels rather frequently between these two towns. SEIDLER has written a book on the History of Political Thought and this was published in Ukrainian in Lvov and in Russian in Moscow. Subject stated that SEIDLER was in New York, on a three months' leave of absence, possibly at Columbia and that Subject had written to SEIDLER about his decision to remain in England.

Subject wrote MORFACH that he had recently met an American, Paul DODYK, a Ukrainian born in the U.S. who had travelled to the Ukraine. DODYK was in Ivov and wanted to visit the town of SHORNYI, the place where his relatives lived, but he was not permitted to travel there. Subject also mentioned a Russian and a Ukrainian student who was studying at Oxford, but said that he would meet them for the first time later on. Subject also mentioned that Mykhailo LESIV had written a letter more to Subject, saying that there was a great demand for a book for Ukrainians, entitled "How to Learn Polish" but that such a book was not available. LESIV told Subject that he was travelling a great deal during the summer and autumn in the USSR and also had visited UZBEGPOB. Subject said that the letter was very optimistic in tone. (This information was provided by Subject in response to a question from MORFACH about what students of Ukrainian or Russian nationality at Oxford.)

AECASSOWARY 29 asked MORFACH to reply to Subject and attempt to find out whether the Polish authorities in England or elsewhere knew of Subject's plans to stay in England. AECASSOWARY 29 also asked MORFACH to invite Subject to Germany as soon as it is possible and is convenient. MORFACH is quite sure to introduce AECASSOWARY 29 to Subject if the visit transpires. MORFACH did not ask a specific question about SMOTH, since this would introduce an intelligence note to the correspondence, which should not be done at this stage. AECASSOWARY 29 will recontact MORFACH on 14 November to determine if any information has been received from Subject.

7. This new information from Subject upon the possibility of sending Subject back to Poland even more remote than believed previously since it is obvious that Subject has informed a fairly wide group of his intentions to remain in England, including his ex-supervisor, Professor SMEDLEY. Both AECASSOWARY 29 and the undersigned felt that there was too great a chance that the Polish authorities might already be aware of Subject's intentions and felt that SMOTH probably had been contacted by the Home Office as a part of granting a permit to remain in England. We also felt that Subject's desire to remain a Polish citizen and to keep his passport Polish was an unusual aspect of his desire to remain in England and was a factor that we could not resolve until we had a discussion with Subject himself. We then considered that it would be very complicated to attempt to invite Subject to come to Germany prior to his final moves to remain in England. We considered that he would have a German visa and that his application for such a visa might come to the attention of not only the British, but also the Polish authorities, and that this fact might well create undue interest in Subject's movements and contacts and thereby preclude any possibility of utilizing Subject on a mission to exploit his contacts in Poland, which we felt we could exploit through other means in the future. We therefore felt that we should not jeopardize our future plans by attempting to capitalize on the very slim chance that immediate operational exploitation could be accomplished. We also realized that our delay might prevent SMOTH to intervene, but we were willing to risk this rather than possibly promising our future interests in the case to SMOTH and the Polish authorities. Therefore, we decided that it would be better to allow Subject to complete his plans for remaining in England with the help of the college authorities and the British Home Office, and then attempt to develop Subject for future exploitation of his contacts when the time seemed to be more propitious. However, we have taken no action which would preclude the possibility of contacting Subject at once to attempt to persuade him to return to Poland.

SECRET

mission if Headquarters decides that on balance the results warrant the risk of exposure. We would, of course, prefer to have AMCASPOWELL travel to England with Dr. ROEBACH to contact Subject there, but realize that the relations between KUBARK and SMOTH seem to preclude this kind of activity in England. We will continue to report by cable any new information as it comes in this operation and will attempt to make the most of any opportunity that might arise.

APPROVED []

DISTRIBUTION

~~2-OR~~
1-EE
2-003

SECRET